SIMPSON, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5461) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees on the estimated total assets under direct or indirect control by certain senior Iranian leaders and other figures, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 876, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5931, PROHIBITING FUTURE RANSOM PAYMENTS TO IRAN ACT, AND WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114–781) on the resolution (H. Res. 879) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5931) to provide for the prohibition on cash payments to the Government of Iran, and for other purposes, and waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REQUIRE EVALUATION BEFORE IMPLEMENTING EXECUTIVE WISHLISTS ACT OF 2016

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H.R. 3438.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 875 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3438.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1627

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3438) to amend title 5, United States Code, to postpone the effective date of high-impact rules pending judicial review, with Mr. SIMPSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Washington's regulatory system is one that virtually every day places new obstacles in the path of American jobs and economic growth. The biggest obstacles of all are new regulations that impose more than $1 billion per year in costs on the American economy.

Struggling workers, families, and small business owners have every right to ask why regulations that cost this much are ever promulgated at all. Surely, there are less costly measures that are effective and should be adopted instead.

Those less costly measures would allow many more resources to be devoted to job creation and productive investment. But billion-dollar rules are promulgated, and there are more and more as the Obama administration grinds to an end. This is one of the reasons our economy has faced so much difficulty in achieving a full recovery under the Obama administration's misguided policies.

Making matters worse, when billion-dollar rules are challenged in court, regulated entities must often sink billions of dollars into compliance while litigation is pending even if that litigation ultimately will be successful. Such was the case in Michigan v. EPA, for example, in which an Environmental Protection Agency rule for utilities imposed about $10 billion in costs to achieve just $4 million to $6 million in benefits. That is, at best, about $1,600 in costs for every $1 of benefit.

□ 1630

This is money for job creation and economic recovery we simply cannot afford to waste. But EPA and the courts allowed it to be wasted for years during successful litigation challenging the rule, because neither the EPA nor the courts stayed the rule.

The REVIEW Act, introduced by Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law Chairman MARINO, is a commonsense measure that responds to this problem with a simple, bright-line test. Under the bill, if a new regulation imposes $1 billion or more in annual cost, it will not go into effect until after litigation challenging it is resolved. Of course, if the regulation is not challenged, it may go into effect as normal. This is a balanced approach, and it provides a healthy incentive for agencies to promulgate effective, but lower-cost regulations that are more legally sound to begin with.

I want to thank Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law Chairman TOM MARINO for his work on this important legislation.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 3438 would stay the enforcement of any rule imposing an annual cost to the economy in excess of $1 billion, pending judicial review.

Now, do you suspect what that might do? It would have a pernicious impact on rulemaking and the ability of agencies to respond to critical health and safety issues. In essence, the bill would encourage anyone who wants to delay a significant rule from going into effect to simply seek a judicial review of the rule.

Please, we all know that the judicial review process can take months—sometimes years—to finalize, especially if the appellate process reaches the United States Supreme Court. So rather than ensuring predictability and streamlining the rulemaking process, this bill would have the completely opposite impact by making the process less predictable and more time-consuming.

Equally important, H.R. 3438 has absolutely no health or safety emergency exceptions. If anything, this bill would empower the very entities that caused a serious health or safety risk to delay and maybe even derail legitimate efforts by regulatory agencies to respond to such threats.

As with other bills proposed by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, this legislation myopically focuses only on the cost of a proposed rule while ignoring the rule's benefits, which often exceed its costs by many multiples.

In closing, there is broad agreement among experts in the administrative law field that our Nation's regulatory system is already too cumbersome and slow-moving.

Now, in addition to the Administrative Procedure Act's procedural mechanisms which are designed to ensure an

open and fair rulemaking system, Congress has passed various additional Federal laws that impose further rulemaking requirements, and rulemaking agencies must also comply with a number of executive orders issued over the past several decades that have created additional layers of analytical and procedural requirements. The result of this dense web of existing requirements is a complex, time-consuming rulemaking process.

In response to the explosion of analytical requirements imposed on the rulemaking process, the American Bar Association as well as many administrative law experts have urged Congress to exercise restraint and assess the usefulness of existing requirements before considering sweeping legislation.

Imposing new analytical and procedural requirements on the administrative system also carries real human and economic costs. As Professor Weissman, the president of Public Citizen, has observed, the cost of regulatory delay is ''far more severe than generic inefficiency. Lengthy delay costs money and lives; it permits ongoing ecologic destruction and the infliction of needless injury; and it enables fraudsters and wrongdoers to perpetuate their misdeeds.''

Rather than alleviating these problems, H.R. 3438 would clearly exacerbate them. Accordingly, I must urge Members to oppose this ill-conceived legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO), the chief sponsor of the legislation and the chairman of the Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the full committee chairman, Mr. GOODLATTE, for supporting the REVIEW Act as an original cosponsor and for moving it through the Judiciary Committee. I am also grateful for the many other Members who have cosponsored this bill.

The REVIEW Act rests upon a very simple premise: that regulations with annual costs exceeding $1 billion annually should receive full judicial review before they go into effect.

The regulations we are concerned about are so massive that their compliance costs are felt nationwide. These regulations touch every corner of our economy. They drive up the cost to put food on the table and clothes on our backs, and, in the worst of situations, they take away the very jobs Americans have earned.

Due to these immense costs, it is not only prudent, but appropriate that aggrieved parties have their day in court. These costs demand that executive agencies must justify their reasoning and legal underpinnings of their rulemaking. Requiring American taxpayers and businesses to comply before the judicial process runs its course reeks of injustice.

Historically, these high-impact rules with costs over $1 billion annually have been few and far between. Since 2006, there have been just 26 in total. However, in recent years, their number has grown exponentially alongside the growth and reach of the regulatory state. There have been an average of three over the past 8 years and six in 2014 alone.

Although some may insist that the straightforward reforms in this bill overreach, recent events indicate otherwise. Last summer, in the Supreme Court's decision in Michigan v. EPA, we saw firsthand the irreparable harm that can occur when expansive, costly, and poorly crafted regulations are not given time for review. In this case, the Court found that the EPA had promulgated its Utility MACT power plant rule through a faulty process and on legally infirm grounds because it chose not to consider costs when promulgating the rule. The costs of the rule were estimated by the EPA itself—by the EPA who created the rule—at $9.6 billion per year. In return, the EPA's best estimate of potential benefits were in the range of a mere $4 million to $6 million—with an M—annually.

As the late Justice Antonin Scalia wrote in his opinion for the Court: ''One would not say that it is even rational, never mind 'appropriate,' to impose billions of dollars in economic costs in return for a few dollars in health or environmental benefits.''

Unfortunately for workers, homeowners, and taxpayers across the country, when the Utility MACT rule was promulgated in early 2012 and after litigation began, neither the EPA nor Court stayed it, pending judicial review. It remained in effect as litigation took 3 years to work itself to a final decision in the Supreme Court in 2015. When review finally got to the Court, the effects were nearly irreversible.

Action on the REVIEW Act is a reasonable step on our part to continue proper and reasonable regulatory reforms.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, action on the REVIEW Act is a reasonable step on our part to continue proper and responsible regulatory reform.

In the end, this is a bill that encourages smaller, sensible rulemaking. When the costs are borne on the back of our constituents, this is a cause that we all certainly can get behind.

Mr. Chairman, it is not only important because of the jobs that are lost, because of the businesses, the manufacturing companies that are going out of business because of these rules by the EPA and other agencies, but it is Congress' responsibility to litigate and Congress' responsibility to set budgets and control the purse strings.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in opposition to H.R. 3438, the Require Evaluation Before Implementing Executive Wishlists Act of 2016, also known as the REVIEW Act, which would automatically stay so-called high-impact rules that a party challenges by filing suit in court.

Now, this is a very arcane and esoteric subject that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will literally put you to sleep listening to their arguments about it. But make no mistake about it, this is a very important piece of legislation that would torpedo the good work of legislators who are trying to protect the health, safety, and well-being of the American people.

Simply put, this bill is yet another reckless measure designed to delay the implementation of the most important rules protecting the health, safety, and financial well-being of everyday people. Passage of this bill will only benefit the pocketbooks of the large corporations in the top 1 percent while the American people will be left unprotected from corporate greed.

Other than satisfying the insatiable thirst of the superwealthy for more and more and more profits to stuff into their already fat and overflowing pockets, this bill is completely unnecessary and is not in the best interest of the greater good.

Under current law, both courts and the agency issuing a rule may stay the effective date of a final rule. While agencies have broad discretion in postponing the effective date of a rule, a court considers several factors in deciding whether to stay a rule, including whether the party is likely to succeed on the merits.

In 2009, the Supreme Court, in Nken v. Holder, instructed courts to consider four factors when deciding whether to issue a stay: One, whether the stay applicant has made a strong showing that he is likely to succeed on the merits; two, whether the applicant will be irreparably injured absent a stay; three, whether the issuance of the stay will substantially injure the other parties interested in the proceedings; and, four, where the public interest lies.

The REVIEW Act would discard this very flexible and practical test in favor of an inflexible and unyielding requirement that agencies automatically delay the effective date of any rule exceeding $1 billion in costs that is challenged in court regardless of whether the party challenging the rule has any likelihood of success on the merits, is actually harmed by the rule, or whether staying the rule would be contrary to the public interest.

□ 1645

It is virtually guaranteed that every high-impact rule would be delayed through litigation challenges, regardless of whether the litigation is meritorious. Frivolous litigation would almost certainly create years of delays

for these rules which, in many cases, have already taken years to promulgate.

But the bill wouldn't just simply apply to lifesaving rules that exceed $1 billion in costs that keep our air clean and our children safe. Rather, it would likely apply to transfer rules which involve the transfer of funds for budgetary programs authorized by Congress, such as transfer rules involving the Medicare program or the Federal Pell Grant Program, as the Office of Management and Budget has clarified.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, I oppose this bill because it is a dangerous solution to a nonexistent problem. Any party affected by a final agency action may challenge that action in court while agencies may also delay the effective date of rules on a discretionary basis. Professor William Funk, a leading administrative law expert, explains that existing law ''weeds out frivolous claims and takes account of both the cost of the rule and the benefits of the rule that would be avoided by granting the stay.'' Absent any evidence whatsoever that courts have inappropriately refused to grant stays, I am confident that existing law provides adequate protection.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation and make in order any of the amendments that you will hear hereafter.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the REVIEW Act. Since 2009, this administration has imposed almost 21,000 rules and regulations on U.S. families and job creators. Of those, over 200 are major regulations, costing $108 billion annually, $22 billion of that coming from 43 major rules just last year.

These regulations suffocate opportunity and economic freedom. Whether it is EPA's rule that will double the electricity bills of hardworking families or EPA's waters of the U.S. Federal land grab rule that will force landowners to get permission from the Federal Government in order to make decisions on their land or face onerous fines, it is time to rein in the Federal control over our lives that is hurting people.

In my district in western central Missouri, one of these rules, the Department of Labor's overtime rule, which is set to go into effect December 1, will hurt everyday Americans, raising the cost of living while reducing wages and incomes.

A senior care group in my district has told me that this rule will likely lead to a reduction in hiring, meaning fewer seniors will be able to get care. Schools have expressed concerns that they will be forced to cut staff and limit the educational services and extracurricular activities they provide for our students. A bank in my district will have to transition 13 of their salaried tellers on staff to hourly wage workers in order to assume the $129,000 in anticipated compliance costs from this rule. Religious organizations have also told me that they will have to cut staff, reducing their ability to provide charitable services to those in need.

Washington's top-down mandates are hurting our friends and our neighbors. We need this bill to stop these overbearing regulations which cripple industries and harm American livelihoods. Instead of stifling opportunity, we should remove barriers to job creation and economic prosperity. I urge my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

The majority argues that H.R. 3438 responds to cases where a court vacates a rule after it has already gone into effect. The majority argues that H.R. 3438 responds to the Supreme Court's 2015 decision in Michigan v. EPA, where the Court remanded a clean air rule adopted by the Environmental Protection Agency to reduce power plants' emissions of hazardous air pollutants.

As leading administrator and law professor William Funk has noted, the Court remanded the rule rather than vacating it altogether because the ''grounds upon which the Supreme Court found the rule invalid appear to be easily remedied.'' He further observes that delaying this rule would cost the U.S. economy $20- to $80 billion per year.

Importantly, the industry and State challengers to the EPA's rule at issue in Michigan v. EPA did not seek judicial stay of the rule prior to the Court's remand. Perhaps that is because they knew it would fail and that they could not meet the judicial test requiring showings of irreparable harm and likelihood of success on the merits.

These challengers are hardly in a good position to complain now about the rule being found unlawful in one respect but not unlawful with respect to every other issue raised by the challengers when they themselves even failed to ask the Court to stay the rule beforehand.

Furthermore, notwithstanding the majority's misleading claims that this rule caused irreparable harm and cost billions of dollars to implement while only offering potential benefits in the millions of dollars, the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, which is the same entity that would be charged with conducting cost estimates under the bill, states that annual benefits of the rule range between $30- and $90 billion, very much dwarfing its annual cost of $9.6 billion.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I thank the ranking member.

Following the Court's remand, the EPA has reaffirmed its original finding that it is appropriate to achieve deep cuts in mercury and up to 7 dozen hazardous air pollutants such as lead, arsenic, and benzene from coal-burning power plants even after considering cost, which was the only issue in the Supreme Court's remand of the case.

This rule delivers immense benefits to Americans, with monetized benefits greatly outweighing compliance costs. An automatic stay brought by the REVIEW Act would result in all of those health hazards—4,200 premature deaths, 2,800 cases of chronic bronchitis, and on and on and on. The automatic stay brought by the REVIEW Act, if it passes, would result in so many health hazards occurring to Americans and health costs being borne by the public after the rules compliance date.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this ill-founded and ill-conceived piece of legislation.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, there is broad opposition to H.R. 3438. In the context of a veto threat, the Obama administration notes in its Statement of Administration Policy that H.R. 3438 would ''promote unwarranted litigation, introduce harmful delay, and, in many cases, thwart implementation of statutory mandates and execution of duly enacted laws,'' and would also ''increase business uncertainty and undermine much-needed protections for the American public, including critical rules that provide financial reform and protect public health, food safety, and the environment.''

The Coalition for Sensible Safeguards, which includes more than 150 diverse labor, consumer, public health, food safety, financial reform, faith, environmental, and scientific integrity groups representing millions of Americans, strongly opposes H.R. 3438, stating that it ''will make the single biggest problem in our current regulatory process, namely, excessive and out of control regulatory delays, even worse.''

Other leading consumer and public interest groups strongly oppose this misguided legislation, noting that, ''like numerous other anti-regulatory bills,'' H.R. 3438 ''further tilts the regulatory process in favor of corporate special interests by creating more opportunities for the manipulation and abuse of the process to their benefit and at the expense of protecting consumers, working families, and other vulnerable communities.''

Indeed, this bill is no different than the many other antiregulatory bills considered this Congress. It is a dangerous solution to a problem that is nonexistent. Accordingly, I urge each and every one of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to resist this and oppose H.R. 3438.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman from Michigan makes reference to the administration's Statement of Administration Policy on H.R. 3438. The administration opposes this bill precisely because it would be effective. It would help to halt their regulatory overreach. The administration claims that this bill is unnecessary because rulemaking procedures already exist to ensure that new rules are as least burdensome as possible and produce a net benefit, and courts already can issue judicial stays. But the whole reason for this legislation is that the administration is ignoring such procedures. The courts rarely issue judicial stays, and by the time the courts finally strike down illegal rules, it is too late.

For example, the administration lost in Michigan v. EPA because it failed to consider the costs and benefits of the rule which imposed about $10 billion in costs to achieve just $4- to $6 million in benefits. By the time the Court issued the ruling, huge sums had already been spent on compliance.

These are resources that otherwise could have gone into productive jobs and investment rather than complying with an illegal rule. Our economy cannot afford this waste. Do not be fooled by the administration's fear-mongering about delaying rules addressing public safety emergencies. It is difficult to imagine a public safety emergency requiring a billion-dollar rule to solve.

Indeed, we reviewed a list of billion-dollar rules issued since 2000, and not one responds to an immediate public safety emergency. Even if there were such a case, imposing costs of that magnitude for whatever reason should be made by elected representatives accountable to the people, not agency bureaucrats. Instead of recommending a veto of this bill, the President's senior advisers should recommend agencies faithfully follow rulemaking procedures so Congress does not have to shorten the leash even further.

Billion-dollar rules are a fast-growing plague inflicted by Washington's out-of-control regulators on small businesses and ordinary citizens throughout the land. According to a 2014 report by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, over 30 billion-dollar rules since the year 2000 are imposing roughly $100 billion a year in costs on our struggling economy. The American Action Forum reports that the Obama administration plans to impose at least another $113 billion in regulatory costs before it leaves office, and this is on top of the estimated $2 trillion-plus in total costs from Washington regulators that are crushing our economy and strangling economic recovery.

□ 1700

It is time for measures that shout, ''Stop,'' to Washington's regulators and force them to find a better way. That is exactly what this bill does. It imposes automatic stays when new billion-dollar rules are challenged in court so small businesses and hard-working Americans don't have to bear the crushing cost of illegal rules while they pursue their rights in court. It creates a powerful incentive for agencies tempted to zoom past the billion-dollar mark to stop, turn around, and find a less costly way to achieve the same benefits for the American people.

Hopefully, once this bill becomes law, we will stop seeing needless billion-dollar rules. And if we ever do need a billion-dollar-a-year solution, this bill will help make sure regulators leave it to the accountable Members of Congress to make such monumental policy decisions by statute.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 3438

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Require Evaluation before Implementing Executive Wishlists Act of 2016'' or as the ''REVIEW Act of 2016''.

SEC. 2. RELIEF PENDING REVIEW.

Section 705 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''When'' and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—When''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) HIGH-IMPACT RULES.—

''(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

''(A) the term 'Administrator' means the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget; and

''(B) the term 'high-impact rule' means any rule that the Administrator determines may impose an annual cost on the economy of not less than $1,000,000,000.

''(2) IDENTIFICATION.—A final rule may not be published or take effect until the agency making the rule submits the rule to the Administrator and the Administrator makes a determination as to whether the rule is a high-impact rule, which shall be published by the agency with the final rule.

''(3) RELIEF.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an agency shall postpone the effective date of a high-impact rule of the agency until the final disposition of all actions seeking judicial review of the rule.

''(B) FAILURE TO TIMELY SEEK JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Notwithstanding section 553(d), if no person seeks judicial review of a high-impact rule—

''(i) during any period explicitly provided for judicial review under the statute authorizing the making of the rule; or

''(ii) if no such period is explicitly provided for, during the 60-day period beginning on the date on which the high-impact rule is published in the Federal Register,

the high-impact rule may take effect as early as the date on which the applicable period ends.

''(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to impose any limitation under law on any court against the issuance of any order enjoining the implementation of any rule.''.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 114–777. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 114–777.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 19, strike ''; and'' and insert a semicolon.

Page 3, line 21, insert after ''rule'' the following: ''(other than an excepted rule)''.

Page 3, line 23, strike the period and insert ''; and''.

Page 3, insert after line 23 the following:

(C) the term ''excepted rule'' means any rule that would reduce the cost of healthcare for a person over the age of 65.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 875, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, my amendment would exempt rules that reduce the cost of health care for Americans over the age of 65 from the unnecessary requirements of this legislation.

Mr. Chair, our country's seniors face growing healthcare costs, and any delays in rules that could reduce those costs would be a terrible burden to place on America's seniors.

According to the latest retiree healthcare cost estimates from Fidelity Benefits Consulting, a 65-year-old couple retiring this year will need an average of $260,000 in today's dollars to cover medical expenses throughout their retirement. That applies only to retirees with traditional Medicare insurance coverage and does not include costs associated with nursing home care.

Fidelity estimates that a 65-year-old couple would need an additional

$130,000 to ensure against long-term care expenses. That is because the median annual cost for the base rent at an assisted living community is about $41,000 per year. The average annual cost for skilled nursing is about $71,000 per year. Because much long-term care is provided by unpaid family caregivers or is covered by Medicaid, the average senior's lifetime out-of-pocket long-term care expenses are about $50,000.

The legislation before us would open up the rulemaking process to lengthy delay tactics, allowing companies or entities opposed to certain rules to take advantage of the court system to stymie final rulemaking for years. Our seniors don't have years to wait on policies that could save them precious dollars in their retirement. There is already a robust process in place for opponents to challenge them in court, with the decision whether to delay a rule rightly placed in the court's hands.

This legislation is a gift to special interests who will benefit from the delay of the imposition of rules that reduce costs for seniors. These special interests are willing to spend millions of dollars and waste years fighting regulations that will benefit the American people, particularly our seniors.

High-impact rules typically involve either the transfer of Federal funds or rules with billions of dollars in benefits to the public. During fiscal year 2014, for example, executive branch agencies adopted 53 major rules, 35 of which were transfer rules. According to the Office of Management and Budget, transfer rules merely implement Federal budgetary programs as required or authorized by Congress, such as rules associated with the Medicare program and the Federal Pell Grant Program.

There are 44.9 million seniors on Medicare in this country. Frivolous lawsuits to delay rules that will increase benefits or those that will produce cost savings would be a grave betrayal of the promise that we have made to keep America's seniors healthy.

My amendment simply ensures that any rule that reduces costs of health care for Americans 65 or older will not be subject to unnecessary delays.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, the REVIEW Act applies to all new billion-dollar rules. That is for one simple reason: the harm that wasting billions of dollars in unnecessary compliance costs does to job creation, productive investment, and economic recovery. Those costs should not have to be incurred during ultimately successful litigation challenging new billion-dollar rules.

The amendment is concerned primarily with transfer rules that authorize the flow of funding between Federal healthcare accounts for seniors. With respect to those rules, there is no need for concern that the bill would impede the operation of those rules. To my knowledge, there has never been a billion-dollar transfer rule, much less one affecting seniors, that has been challenged in court, nor am I am aware of any reason to expect that one ever will be challenged. The bill, of course, only requires a stay if a timely challenge to a rule is brought in court.

As for other rules that may be within the amendment's scope, if such rules are needed, then agencies can avoid the bill's application by coming up with effective regulations that cost less than $1 billion a year. That is a goal to be pursued, not blocked.

If, in an unusual case, the needed solution truly must cost a billion dollars a year or more, then the decision to adopt that solution is a decision Congress should make, not an agency. Congress, moreover, can make that decision without hindrance of litigation through fair and open consideration and debate by the people's Representatives, not unaccountable bureaucrats.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, the chairman just made my point. This legislation, as currently written, would apply to all rules, including rules that would reduce the cost of health care for America's seniors. In fact, the OMB says—and I repeat—that a transfer rule merely ''implements Federal budgetary programs, as required or authorized by Congress, such as rules associated with the Medicare program and the Federal Pell Grant Program.

So we know, in fact, that, according to OMB, the Medicare program is considered part of the transfer rule. So this legislation, as currently written, means that all rules, including any rule that is promulgated that would reduce costs for seniors would, in fact, be subjected to this delay.

My amendment is necessary, by the chairman's own admission. We need this amendment so that we can at least exempt out those provisions that might produce real savings for America's seniors.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. DELBENE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 114–777.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 19, strike ''; and'' and insert a semicolon.

Page 3, line 21, insert after ''rule'' the following: ''(other than an excepted rule)''.

Page 3, line 23, strike the period and insert ''; and''.

Page 3, insert after line 23 the following:

(C) the term ''excepted rule'' means any rule that would increase college affordability.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 875, the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 3438, which would exempt from the bill any rule related to increasing the affordability of higher education.

It is no secret that the rising cost of college is posing grave challenges to students and families across the country. Every year, Americans are being forced to take out higher loan amounts to pay for tuition, fees, textbooks, and housing. Today, student debt totals more than $1.3 trillion.

In my home State of Washington, 56 percent of graduates from 4-year universities leave school with debt and, on average, those students owe more than $23,000 upon graduation. At a time when Americans owe more in student loan debt than credit card debt, it is more critical than ever that we prioritize college affordability for all.

The issue is personal for me. When I was young, my father lost his job, and my parents never got back on track financially. But thanks to student loans and financial aid, I was still able to get a great education. With that education and hard work, I was able to build a successful career and be in the position that I am in today.

We need to make sure students have the same opportunities that were available to us. That starts by protecting the Department of Education's ability to administer vital financial aid programs like Pell grants and Federal student loans. These programs have enabled millions of low-income students to attend college. If we restrict the Department's ability to administer them, we are also endangering the millions of hardworking Americans who rely on their critical support.

This year alone, more than 8.4 million low-income students will benefit from Pell grants. Over 20 million student loans will be issued to help students and families afford the cost of college. We cannot put these essential resources at risk. They help ensure higher education is never out of reach, and they must be protected.

That is why I am offering this straightforward and narrowly tailored amendment. It simply protects the Department of Education's ability to administer Federal student aid programs that keep college affordable and accessible to all.

Today, too many families are struggling to put their kids through college, and we should be making it easier for them, not harder. My amendment will prevent the underlying bill from threatening the vital assistance offered each year through Pell grants, student loans, and other forms of financial aid.

Particularly as students are heading back to school in communities across the country, I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARINO. Once again, the REVIEW Act applies to all new billion-dollar rules. The bill's relief is urgently needed. Failures to require stays of billion-dollar rules during litigation wastes billions of dollars in unnecessary compliance costs and resources that are needlessly paid. Those costs are essential to job creation, productive investment, and economic recovery. These costs should not have to be incurred during ultimate successful litigation challenging new billion-dollar rules.

If education rules like those the amendment would carve out are needed, the relevant agencies can avoid the bill's application by coming up with effective regulations that cost less than $1 billion a year. That is a goal to be pursued, not blocked, especially when it is the presence in higher education that is actually driving up much of the cost concerning the upward spiral in the cost of higher education.

If, in an unusual case, a needed solution truly must cost a billion dollars a year or more, then, once again, the decision to adopt that solution is a decision Congress should make, not an agency.

With all due respect, my friend and I have worked on legislation together. I have a list here of the billion-dollar rules and there is nothing—not one name on here—that has anything to do with the Department of Education.

Furthermore, I would love to work on a piece of legislation reducing the cost of post-high school education with my colleague. I didn't start college until after I was 30. My wife and I put me through college and law school. We borrowed money through grants and anything we could do. I know the cost of education was expensive back then, and I am stymied at what it is now, but this is not the mechanism to do that.

This legislation that Republicans brought to the floor—my legislation—deals with overseeing the government and the regulation that is crushing jobs in this country. Congress has the responsibility, as I repeat, to make the laws and to control the purse strings.

So I offer again to my good friend an opportunity to work with her on lowering the cost of education in this country, but I think it should be in a separate piece of legislation and not this. I ask my colleagues to not support the amendment and I ask them to support the overall legislation that we brought to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Chairman, the bill, as it exists, doesn't require challenges to have any merit, so it opens the door to frivolous lawsuits. The Office of Management and Budget did say that this would hit the billion-dollar threshold.

I do think that it is very, very important that we support my amendment so that we protect students today from harmful, unintended consequences of the REVIEW Act. I want to thank my colleague for being willing to work together on ways to improve college affordability going forward. I would ask that he support this amendment as part of that, but I would be happy to work with him on other issues as well.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1715

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 114–777 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. CICILLINE of Rhode Island.

Amendment No. 2 by Ms. DELBENE of Washington.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 232, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 532]

AYES—189

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—232

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett

Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—10

Brooks (AL)
Moore
Palmer
Poe (TX)
Rogers (AL)
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Schrader
Tiberi
Walters, Mimi

□ 1742

Messrs. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, WEBSTER of Florida, WESTERMAN, REICHERT, HURT of Virginia, BURGESS, BILIRAKIS, COLLINS of New York, Ms. STEFANIK, Messrs. WOODALL, GOODLATTE, JOLLY, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. MOOLENAAR changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, DENT, BLUM, CURBELO of Florida, and KATKO changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. DELBENE

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 237, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 533]

AYES—184

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—237

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Farr
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—10

Bass
Moore
Poe (TX)
Rice (NY)
Rogers (AL)
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Schrader
Tiberi
Walters, Mimi

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1746

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIR. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3438) to amend title 5, United States Code, to postpone the effective date of high-impact rules pending judicial review, and, pursuant

to House Resolution 875, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

□ 1745

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Thompson of Mississippi moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3438 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 3, line 21, insert after ''rule'' the following: ''(except as provided in subsection (c))''.

Page 5, insert after ''of any rule.'' on line 4 the following:

''(c) EXCEPTION FOR RULES TO DECREASE THE VULNERABILITY OF THE PUBLIC TO A TERRORIST ATTACK.—The provisions of subsection (b) do not apply in the case of a rule that pertains to protecting the Nation against security threats.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to the committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Just over a week ago, the Nation observed the 15th anniversary of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attack. On that day, terror and hate not only took the lives of 3,000 innocent people, but also inflicted $3.3 trillion in economic damage to our Nation. In response to this unprecedented attack on U.S. soil, the Department of Homeland Security was established.

To be successful, DHS must work with State, local, and private sector partners. Many of DHS's programs are voluntary, but in some areas, where the threats are high and voluntary measures are inadequate, DHS utilizes Federal rulemaking.

As we saw last weekend in Minnesota, New York, and New Jersey, the threat picture is constantly evolving. Today, the threat of individuals acting alone, inspired online by foreign and domestic terrorist groups, is arguably one of the greatest homeland security challenges we face. Our government needs to be able to respond to evolving threats like the ''lone wolf'' threat.

I am alarmed to see that, under this bill, critical action by the Department of Homeland Security could be indefinitely hamstrung, as protracted, possibly frivolous, legal challenges move through the courts. From a homeland security standpoint, there is no justification for putting arbitrary obstacles in the way of DHS when it needs to issue regulations to protect critical infrastructure from infiltration by terrorists, keep dangerous materials out of terrorists' hands, and secure the border, yet the underlying bill would do just that.

Mr. Speaker, my motion to recommit would provide for an exception to the rule in instances that ''pertain to protecting the Nation against security threats.'' There are things we can do to make the country more secure, but it seems that the majority lacks the will to do so.

Earlier today, Democrats tried to get legislation to bar individuals on the no-fly terrorist watch list from buying guns considered. The majority blocked the legislation.

Then we tried to get considered a measure that I authored to expand DHS' overseas screening and vetting operations to protect ISIL-trained European foreign fighters and other dangerous people from entering the United States. This measure was blocked, too.

This morning, Mr. Speaker, in my committee, we received testimony from prominent law enforcement officials about how the availability of firearms put their officers and the citizens they protect in harm's way. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the Austin, Texas, police chief testified that police chiefs are ''haunted'' by the threat posed by the ''widespread availability of firearms in our country,'' which ''makes it possible for potentially dangerous persons to legally acquire weapons to cause mayhem and colossal casualties.''

To this point, this past weekend, in a St. Cloud, Minnesota, mall, 10 people, including a pregnant woman, were stabbed by a young man who is believed to have been radicalized by ISIL. Thankfully, all the injured individuals are expected to recover.

These days, it is not too hard to imagine the carnage that could have been inflicted on this innocent population if the assailant had, instead, entered the mall with an AK–47 assault weapon and large-capacity clips.

This Congress must show leadership on the pressing homeland security challenges to the Nation. Standing in the way of the Department of Homeland Security, as it tries to protect our citizens, is the wrong thing to do.

For these and a number of other reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote ''aye'' on my motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, billion-dollar rules are among the worst offenses of the pen-and-phone Obama administration. This administration is using overreaching billion-dollar rules to insert EPA's water permitting agents into every American's backyard. It is using overreaching billion-dollar rules to shut down this country's cheap generation of electricity. It is using overreaching billion-dollar rules to impose unachievable ozone standards that will strangle economic opportunities in counties all over this Nation. Above all, wherever it can, it is using overreaching billion-dollar rules to execute end runs around Congress and achieve legislative ends it knows it cannot achieve in Congress.

The Obama administration says, on spurious grounds, it will veto this bill.

This motion to recommit tries to obstruct this bill by means of procedural obstruction. The House has already passed antiterrorism measures. Why do my colleagues across the aisle want to block this good bill?

The legislation that we have passed is H.R. 4401, the Amplifying Local Efforts to Root Out Terror Act; H.R. 4820, the Combating Terrorist Recruitment Act; and H.R. 4407, the Counterterrorism Advisory Board Act. These were all almost unanimously passed. I sit on the Committee on Homeland Security. We have been passing good legislation, and we continue to pass good legislation.

This administration and its allies on the other side of the aisle would rather let Congress duck accountability to the voters for billion-dollar decisions. It would rather give billion-dollar phones and pens to unaccountable bureaucrats up and down Pennsylvania Avenue so they can do things the voters cannot stop.

The American people are telling us every day, ''Enough.'' I am telling President Obama and my colleagues, ''Enough.''

Stand up for accountability. Stand up for the small-business owners and workers who are being crushed by Washington's bureaucratic billion-dollar bullies who are against this motion and please vote for this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX,

this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered; passage of H.R. 5461; and suspending the rules and passing the following bills: H.R. 5859, H.R. 6007, H.R. 5977, H.R. 6014, and H.R. 5147.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 240, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 534]

AYES—182

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—240

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—9

Duffy
Moore
Poe (TX)
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Stivers
Tiberi
Walters, Mimi
Yoder

□ 1804

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 244, noes 180, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 535]

AYES—244

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—180

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett

Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Crenshaw
Moore
Poe (TX)
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Tiberi
Walters, Mimi

□ 1811

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IRANIAN LEADERSHIP ASSET TRANSPARENCY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 5461) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees on the estimated total assets under direct or indirect control by certain senior Iranian leaders and other figures, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 282, nays 143, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 536]

YEAS—282

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bera
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Cárdenas
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Quigley
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—143

Adams
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—6

Moore
Poe (TX)
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Tiberi
Walters, Mimi

□ 1818

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNITY COUNTERTERRORISM PREPAREDNESS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5859) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the major metropolitan area counterterrorism training and exercise grant program, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 395, nays 30, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 537]

YEAS—395

Abraham
Adams
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)